

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/646,391	08/21/2003	Martin Gleave	UBC.P-035	9734	
57381 Marina Larson	590 03/05/2007 Associates, LLC		EXAM	EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 492	8		BOWMAN, AMY HUDSON		
DILLON, CO 80435			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1635		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/05/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/646,391	GLEAVE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Amy H. Bowman	1635	
	7 mily 11. Downlan	1000	

Dorotto and thing of any opposit of	Examiner	Art Offic	·				
	Amy H. Bowman	1635					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence add	iress				
THE REPLY FILED 20 November 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITI	ON FOR ALLOWANCE.					
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date		t forth in the final rejection sub	riahouar ia latar . Ia				
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN							
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee lave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, nay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
NOTICE OF APPEAL	olionos with 27 OFD 44 27 mg	ha filad wikhin two mant	ha af tha data af				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).							
AMENDMENTS	hus maior so should be a selfling o	brick will not be entered b					
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,</li> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further co</li> </ol>			ecause				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		e NOTE below),					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be	•	ally reducing or simplifying	the issues for				
appeal; and/or							
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ally rejected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		on Compliant Amandment	(DTOL 224) ·				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		•					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)							
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	mowable il subfilitted ili a sepa	arate, unlery med amendin	ent canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		will be entered and an	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: <u>1-10 and 14</u> .	•						
Claim(s) objected to:		• • •					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1</u> .		•					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>11 and 12</u> .							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	A bafan an an Aba daka af filin	a a Nation of Amenal will a	at ha amtauad				
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).							
•							
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.  REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  See Continuation Sheet.							
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).							
13. Other:							
	AS School						
	IARAEC COLLIN	Amy H Bowman					
	JAMES SCHULTZ, PH.D. PRIMARY EXAMINER	Examiner Art Unit: 1635					

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: As a result of the petition decision on 1/26/07, oligodeoxynucleotide SEQ ID NOs: 2-19 have been rejoined. Claims 11 and 12 remain withdrawn as being drawn to a non-elected invention. Therefore, applicant has not cancelled the non-elected subject matter. Claims 2-10 and 14 are in condition for allowance, however there is still an outstanding issue with regards to claim 1 as explained below.

Applicant's arguments do not overcome the pending rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. As explained in the office actions mailed on 4/14/06 and 9/18/06, one of ordinary skill in the art would not recognize that applicant was in possession of such a large scope of therapeutic agents, as instantly recited. Upon further consideration, the description regarding antisense oligonucleotides and RNAi inhibitors is sufficient to describe oligonucleotides, as recited in claim 14.

With regards to claim 1, applicant argues that applicants have no control over inhibitors that have not yet been described in the art. However, the test for written description is possession and applicant clearly is not in possession of any therapeutic agent that is effective to reduce the amount of clusterin in melanoma cells by disclosing antisense oligonucleotides and RNAi inhibitors. The claim embraces a multitude of inhibitors such as small molecule inhibitors, antibodies, miRNAs, ribozymes, aptamers, as well as any other inhibitory agent. It is noted that it is improper for applicant to argue an unpublished board decision and such arguments have not been considered. Applicant argues In re Fuetterer, which was responded to by the examiner in the office action mailed on 9/18/06. The examiner is not requiring for applicant to discover which possible therapeutic agents will function properly in the method, but rather is requiring a description of an adequate number of species of therapeutic agents to be used by the method that is commensurate with the scope of the instant claim so that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that applicant was in possession of the claimed invention.